

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 19-21, and 28 were examined and stand finally rejected and claims 2, 5-12, 14-18, and 22-27 were withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, claims 13 and 28 have been amended, support being found for these amendments in at least FIGs. 1-4 of the present application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and request reconsideration in light of the remarks to follow.

It is first noted once again that claims 2, 5-12, 14-18, and 22-27 were withdrawn from consideration as allegedly being drawn to a distinct species. Applicant again asserts that because all the independent claims, which are generic to all of the alleged species, are in condition for allowance as will be set forth more fully below, claims 2, 5-12, and 14-18 are allowable at least due to their dependence upon the allowable generic claims and should be rejoined.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 13 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamp (U.S. Patent No. 4,899,025) in view of Tamura (US Pat. Pub. 2001/039137) and further in view of Carosa (U.S. Patent No. 5,216,402). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The present Office Action, in rejecting claims 1, 3, 4, 13, and 19-21, appears to only address the specific claim elements of claims 19-21, as well as claim 13 somewhat obliquely. Nonetheless, Applicant will address all of the rejected claims based on what may be inferred from the specific rejections and past Office Actions.

Independent claim 1 features, among other things, “an inductive coupling assembly including an inductive coupling sleeve coupled to a first end of a cable assembly, the inductive coupling sleeve having a secondary coil positioned therein and electrically coupled with the cable assembly.” Assuming Tamura is being asserted as teaching the claimed “inductive coupling sleeve” and Carosa as generally teaching removable coupling of a primary and second coils Applicant respectfully submits that these references, either combined or taken separately, do not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements.

Tamura, as argued by Applicant in previous responses, does not teach a sleeve for coupling, but merely a conductive cover 1 to protect a plug 25 (see paragraph [0027]). Thus, Tamura does not offer a teaching of an inductive coupling sleeve or any coupling device, for that

matter. Accordingly, it is not clear how a teaching of a conductive, protective cover for a cable assembly when combined with either Kamp or Carosa, provides teaching to one skilled in the art to arrive at any of the elements of claim 1 (or any of the other rejected claims). Indeed, the teachings of Tamura are not reasonably pertinent to the problem of providing a removable inductive coupling

Further with respect to Carosa, although teaching a separable inductive coupler, this reference does not teach or suggest “an inductive coupling sleeve coupled to a first end of a cable assembly, the inductive coupling sleeve having a secondary coil positioned therein and electrically coupled with the cable assembly.” Rather, the secondary core assembly 13 of Carosa is distinctly not part of a cable assembly or positioned within coupling sleeve as featured in claim 1. Moreover, Applicant submit that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to take the teachings of a protective sleeve to cap off a cable in Tamura, which does not relate to coupling, and apply that to a coupler such as Carosa to arrive at a modified coupling. The two teaching are simply disparate as far as the presently claimed subject matter is concerned. Thus, it would not be obvious, given these cited references, to arrive at the above-recited claimed features.

It is further noted that with respect to Kamp, this reference fails teach the above-discussed claim elements, along with other claimed elements. Accordingly, Kamp, Tamura, and Carosa either separately or combined, additionally fail to teach or suggest this claimed element.

In light of the foregoing comments, claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Kamp and Tamura, either taken singly or in combination.

Dependent claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons and also on their own merits. Furthermore, claim 1 is generic to withdrawn claims 2 and 5-12 and these claims should be rejoined for examination based on the allowability of claim 1.

With respect to independent method claim 13, this claim features, among other things, “coupling a sleeve disposed at a first end of cable assembly to the power supply, where the sleeve includes a secondary coil and a second portion of inductor core where the sleeve encloses at least a portion of the second coil and at least a portion of the second portion of the inductor core.” Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either combined or taken separately, fail to teach or suggest the coupling of a sleeve with a power supply. Moreover, the cited references

do not teach or suggest a cable assembly with a sleeve disposed at one end thereof having a secondary coil and a portion of an inductor core where the sleeve includes a secondary coil and a second portion of inductor core where the sleeve encloses at least a portion of the second coil and at least a portion of the second portion of the inductor core. Accordingly, claim 13 is submitted to be allowable over Kamp, Tamura and Carosa because these references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claim, either taken singly or in combination.

Concerning independent claim 19, the Office Action repeats an assertion that the cathode ray tube 4 of Kamp is taught to be electrically coupled to the secondary coil 13. Applicant again respectfully submits that secondary coil 13 is not electrically coupled to the supports or the tube 4, but magnetically coupled. Thus, the teachings of Kamp still fall short of the claimed term "the secondary coil being electrically coupled to the work head." Also of note here, the claim language further distinguishes electrical coupling and magnetic coupling, so it cannot be said that supports 9 and 10 are "inherently" electrically coupled, when they are in fact only magnetically coupled. The additional teachings of Tamura and Carosa do not make up for this deficiency. Most notably, the present Office Action relies on Carosa as only providing a teaching of removably coupling a primary coil (i.e., coil 24 in Kamp) from a secondary coil (i.e., coil 13 in Kamp). Thus, this does not address or resolve the untenable assertion that tube 4 is "electrically coupled" to the secondary coil 13, when in fact it is not.

Accordingly, for at least the reason above, claim 19 is believed to be allowable over the teachings of Kamp, Tamura, and Carosa, either taken separately or combined.

Dependent claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 19 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons presented above and also on their own merits'.

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamp (U.S. Patent No. 4,899,025) in view of Carosa (U.S. Patent No. 5,216,402). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 28, the Office Action asserts that Kamp discloses all of the elements of this claim except for the inductive coupling removably coupling the coils. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 28, as amended, features, among other things, "a cable assembly having . . . a second end electrically coupled to a work head."; As argued above with respect to claim 19,

Kamp does not teach that tube 4 is "electrically coupled" to the secondary coil 13. Accordingly, Kamp does not meet the claim element above.

Furthermore, amended claim 28 features "a cable assembly having a first end electrically coupled to and at least partially enclosing a secondary coil." As argued above, Carosa fails to teach such an element, where the secondary coil assembly 13 is neither a cable assembly nor a cable assembly configured to enclose a second coil. Accordingly, the cited references further fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 28 and the present rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance and requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

September 14, 2006

Date

By: 

Pamela L. Stewart, Reg. No.: 45,707

Telephone No.: 651-733-2059

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833